

1 E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
United States Attorney  
2 DAVID M. HARRIS  
Assistant United States Attorney  
3 Chief, Civil Division  
JOANNE S. OSINOFF  
4 Assistant United States Attorney  
Chief, General Civil Section  
5 CHRISTINA MARQUEZ (Cal. Bar No. 305301)  
Assistant United States Attorney  
6 Federal Building, Suite 7516  
300 North Los Angeles Street  
7 Los Angeles, California 90012  
Telephone: (213) 894-4061  
8 Facsimile: (213) 894-7819  
E-mail: Christina.Marquez@usdoj.gov

9 Attorneys for United States of America

10  
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
13 WESTERN DIVISION

14 ESVIN FERNANDO ARREDONDO  
RODRIGUEZ INDIVIDUALLY AND  
15 A.F.A.J, A MINOR, BY HER  
GUARDIAN AD LITEM, JEFFREY  
16 HAMILTON

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

20 Defendant.

No. CV 22-02845-JLS-AFM

DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL  
MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR  
DOCUMENT PRODUCTION AND  
ENTRY OF PROTECTIVE ORDER

Hon. Alexander F. MacKinnon  
Hearing Date: April 11, 2023  
Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.

1 Since the filing of Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel on March 15, 2023, through  
2 Defendant's diligent efforts, Defendant has been able to resolve some of the technical  
3 limitations as to the Common Discovery and is prepared to produce almost the entirety  
4 of the Common Discovery upon the entry of Defendant's proposed protective order.

5 Plaintiffs' allegations about the Motion for Sanctions pending in *A.P.F. v. United*  
6 *States*, No. 20-00065-PHX-SRB (D. Ariz. Dec. 14, 2022), ECF No. 328 do not have any  
7 bearing on Defendant's proposed protective order in this case. First, Plaintiffs do not  
8 point to any relevant language in these pending filings in *A.P.F.* related to the  
9 substantive language at issue in Defendant's proposed protective order. Second,  
10 Defendant's proposed protective order in this case is not identical to the protective order  
11 in *A.P.F.* Plaintiffs ignore the fact that the parties substantially met and conferred on the  
12 terms of Defendant's proposed protective order and limited the issues down to three.

13 Plaintiffs have repeatedly asserted their urgency to obtain this Common Discovery  
14 yet want to unravel the extensive negotiations in *A.P.F.* and *C.M.* that have taken place  
15 to streamline the discovery process. If the Court's model protective order is entered,  
16 Defendant will have to re-review those approximately 60,000 pages of documents to add  
17 annotations before production, which would delay the production of the Common  
18 Discovery.

19 Accordingly, Defendant respectfully requests that this Court enter Defendant's  
20 proposed protective order so that discovery can commence in this case without delay.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4 Dated: March 28, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

5 E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
United States Attorney  
6 DAVID M. HARRIS  
Assistant United States Attorney  
7 Chief, Civil Division  
8 JOANNE S. OSINOFF  
Assistant United States Attorney  
9 Chief, General Civil Section

10  
11  
12 /s/ Christina Marquez  
CHRISTINA MARQUEZ  
13 Assistant United States Attorney  
14 Attorneys for Defendant  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28